

9 November, 2005

Corrections and additions to “ Pieces of 2^d : existence and uniqueness for Barnes-Wall and Ypsilanti lattices. ”

Robert L. Griess Jr.
Department of Mathematics
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1043

Abstract

Mainly, we correct the uniqueness result by adding a projection requirement to condition X and give a better proof for the equivalence of commutator density, 2/4-generation and 3/4-generation.

Contents

1	The main results for for Barnes-Wall lattices in [2]	1
2	Revision of equivalence of commutator density, 2/4- and 3/4-generation	2
3	Revision of proof of the uniqueness theorem	5
4	Other Revisions	7

1 The main results for for Barnes-Wall lattices in [2]

The single change for Section 2 of [2] is to add condition (f) to Condition $X(2^d)$, 2.3. The corrected hypothesis is stated below.

Definition 1.1. Condition $X(2^d)$: This is defined for integers $d \geq 2$. Let $s \in \{0, 1\}$ be the remainder of $d + 1$ modulo 2.

We say that the quadruple (L, L_1, L_2, t) is a *an X -quadruple* if it satisfies *condition $X(2^d)$* (or, more simply, *condition X*), listed below:

- (a) L is a rank 2^d even integral lattice containing $L_1 \perp L_2$, the orthogonal direct sum of sublattices $L_1 \cong L_2$ of rank 2^{d-1} ;
- (b) When $d = 2$, $L \cong L_{D_4} \cong BW_4$ and $L_1 \cong L_2 \cong L_{A_1^2}$; when $d \geq 3$, $2^{-\frac{s}{2}}L_1$ and $2^{-\frac{s}{2}}L_2$ are initial entries of quadruples which satisfy condition $X(2^{d-1})$.
- (c) $\mu(L) = 2^{\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor}$.
- (d) $\mathcal{D}(L) \cong 2^{2^{d-1}}, 1$ as d is even, odd, respectively.
- (e) There is an isometry t of order 2 on L which interchanges L_1 and L_2 and satisfies $[L, t] \leq L_1 \perp L_2$, i.e., acts trivially on $L/[L_1 \perp L_2]$.
- (f) The projection of L to each V_i are rank 2^{d-1} BRW-sublattices, i.e., are stable under a natural $BRW^0(2^{d-1}, +)$ -subgroup of $Aut(L)$ which centralizes t and stabilizes each L_i .

2 Revision of equivalence of commutator density, 2/4- and 3/4-generation

This section should replace Section 5.1 of [2](items 5.16 to 5.22), which shows equivalence of commutator density, 2/4-generation and 3/4-generation. We recall the definitions here. Let M be a module for a dihedral group D of order 8 so that the central involution of D acts on M as -1 . Let $f \in D$ be an element of order 4. Commutator density is the property that $[M, D] = M(f - 1)$. The 3/4 generation property is the condition that M is generated by fixed points of any three noncentral involutions of D . The 2/4 generation property is the condition that M be generated by the fixed points of a generating pair of involutions in D .

To fit with [2], change numbers in the revision below to begin with “5.16”.

In this section, “lattice” means just a free abelian group since the bilinear form is irrelevant to the arguments.

Notation 2.1. Let L be a lattice with involution s acting on L . Let $L^\varepsilon(s) := \{v \in L | vs = \varepsilon v\}$ be the ε -eigenlattice for the involution s and let $Tel(s) := L^+(s) \oplus L^-(s)$ be the total eigenlattice for s .

Notation 2.2. Let t, u be involutions which generate the dihedral group D of order 8 and let f be an element of order 4 in D .

Notation 2.3. Let L be a free abelian group of rank $2n$ which admits an action of D in which the central involution $[t, u]$ acts as -1 and let $L_1 := L^-(t)$, $L_2 := L^+(t)$.

We extend the action of D to the ambient vector space $\mathbb{Q} \otimes L$. For integers $\ell \leq m$, let $Q(\ell, m) := 2^\ell \text{Tel}(t) / 2^m \text{Tel}(t)$.

Define integers d, e to be the number of Jordan blocks of size 2, 1 respectively, for the action of u on the elementary abelian group $L/\text{Tel}(t)$.

Lemma 2.4. $|L : \text{Tel}(t)| = 2^{2d+e}$ and $|L : 2\text{Tel}(t)| = 2^{2n+2d+e}$.

Notation 2.5. We have a chain of D -invariant abelian groups $2\text{Tel}(t) \leq L \leq \frac{1}{2}\text{Tel}(t)$. For $g \in D$, we denote by $A(g)$ and $B(g)$ the commutator modules $Q(-1, 1)(g-1) = \frac{1}{2}\text{Tel}(t)(g-1) + 2\text{Tel}(t)/2\text{Tel}(t)$ and $L(g-1) + 2\text{Tel}(t)/2\text{Tel}(t)$, respectively.

Lemma 2.6. $A(u) \cap Q(0, 1) = B(u) \cap Q(0, 1) = Q(0, 1)(u-1)$.

Proof. Clearly, $A(u) \cap Q(0, 1) \geq B(u) \cap Q(0, 1) \geq Q(0, 1)(u-1)$. Now to prove the opposite containment. Since $A(u) \cap Q(0, 1)$ consists of elements inverted by u , hence fixed by u , it is contained in the subgroup $Q(0, 1)(u-1)$ of the free $\mathbb{F}_2\langle u \rangle$ module $Q(0, 1)$. $\square$

Lemma 2.7. $A(t) \cap A(u) = 0$.

Proof. Since $\text{Tel}(t)(t-1) = 2L_1$, the image of $A(t)$ is just $L_1 + 2\text{Tel}(t)/2\text{Tel}(t) \leq Q(0, 1)$. Also, $A(u) \cap Q(0, 1)$ is exactly the image of the diagonal sublattice $\{(x, xu) | x \in L_1\}$ of $L_1 \oplus L_2$ in $Q(0, 1)$. The result follows. $\square$

Lemma 2.8. A coset of $\text{Tel}(t)$ fixed by u contains an element fixed by u .

Proof. Let $x + \text{Tel}(t)$ be such a coset. Since $\text{Tel}(t)$ is a free $\mathbb{Z}\langle u \rangle$ -module, every element of $\text{Tel}(t)$ negated by u is a commutator. Therefore, there exists $v \in \text{Tel}(t)$ so that $x(u-1) = v(u-1)$. Then $x-v$ is fixed by u and is in $x + \text{Tel}(t)$. $\square$

Lemma 2.9. $|B(u)| = 2^{n+d}$.

Proof. The right side is the product of $|Q(0, 1)|^{\frac{1}{2}} = 2^n$ with $2^d = |(L/\text{Tel}(t))(u-1)|$. To evaluate the left side, use 2.6, 2.8. $\square$

Lemma 2.10. The kernel of the endomorphism induced by $t-1$ on $L/2\text{Tel}(t)$ is just $Q(0, 1)$.

Proof. If the kernel were larger, there would be $x \in L \setminus Tel(t)$ so that $x(t-1) \in 2Tel(t)$. Then there would be a unique $y \in L^-(t)$ so that $2y = x(t-1)$, whence $yt = -y$ and $(x+y)t = x+y$ and so $x+y \in L^+(t)$, a contradiction to $x \notin Tel(t)$. $\square$

Corollary 2.11. $|B(t)| = 2^{2d+e}$.

Proof. Since $Q(0,1)$ has index 2^{2d+e} in $L/2Tel(t)$, the result follows from 2.10. $\square$

Lemma 2.12. $B(t) \cap B(u) = 0$ and $|B(t) + B(u)| = 2^{n+3d+e}$.

Proof. For $B(t) \cap B(u) = 0$, use 2.7. The second statement follows from the formula $|B(t) + B(u)| = |B(t)||B(u)|/|B(t) \cap B(u)| = |B(t)||B(u)|$ and 2.9, 2.11. $\square$

Lemma 2.13. $L(t-1) + L(u-1) = [L, D] \geq L(f-1) \geq 2L$.

Proof. First, $L(t-1) + L(u-1) = [L, D]$ holds because t and u generate D . The containment $[L, D] \geq L(f-1)$ is obvious. Since $[L, D]$ contains $L(f-1)$ and $L(f-1)^2 = 2L$, the final containment holds. $\square$

Lemma 2.14. *We have $|B(t)+B(u) : (L(f-1)/2Tel(t))| = 2^{n+3d+e-(2d+e+n)} = 2^d$. Therefore, $L(f-1) = L(t-1) + L(u-1)$ if and only if $d = 0$. In other language, commutator density is equivalent to 2/4 generation.*

Proof. Observe that if M is any f -invariant subgroup of L , then $M(f-1)^2 = 2M$ and that for any integer j , (*) $|M(f-1)^j : M(f-1)^{j+1}| = 2^n$. Since $Tel(t)(f-1) \leq Tel(t)$, we have $2Tel(t) = Tel(t)(f-1)^2 \leq L(f-1) \leq [L, D]$. Both $L(f-1)$ and $L(t-1) + L(u-1) = [L, D]$ contain $2Tel(t)$, whence a basic isomorphism theorem implies that $|L(t-1) + L(u-1) : L(f-1)| = |B(t) + B(u) : (L(f-1)/2Tel(t))|$. The statements follow from 2.4, 2.12 and (*). $\square$

Lemma 2.15. *The properties 2/4-generation and 3/4-generation are equivalent.*

Proof. Obviously, 2/4-generation implies 3/4-generation. Conversely, assume that $L = L^+(t) + L^-(t) + L^+(u)$. Using 2.13, we have $L^+(t) + L^+(u) \geq L(t+1) + L(u+1) = [L, D] \geq 2L$. Since $L^+(t) + 2L = L^-(t) + 2L = L^+(t) + L^-(t)$, $L = L^+(t) + L^-(t) + L^+(u) = L^+(t) + L^+(u) + 2L = L^+(t) + L^+(u)$, whence 2/4-generation. $\square$

Lemmas 2.14 and 2.15 imply the required equivalence of commutator density, 2/4-generation and 3/4-generation.

Remark 2.16. Note that the present version avoids bilinear forms, so does not use the language of determinants. If a D -invariant bilinear form is present, we may replace statements about finite indices of sublattices with ones about determinants. Note that, for a noncentral involution s of D , each $L^\pm(s)$ has the same determinant.

3 Revision of proof of the uniqueness theorem

The following is a replacement for Section 9 in [2] “Proof of Uniqueness”. The statement of Theorem 9.2 is unchanged except for correcting a quotient group in (ii)(a), including a definition in (ii)(c) and converting its final sentence to a remark. The proof is revised, using $X(2^d)(f)$.

Item numbers should be changed to begin with “9.1”. Numbered references internal to the proof refer to [2].

Notation 3.1. Given $d \geq 3$ and L_1, L_2 , we let $\mathfrak{X} := \mathfrak{X}(L_1, L_2)$ be the set of all X -quadruples of the form (L, L_1, L_2, t) ; see 2.3.

Theorem 3.2. *We use the notation in 2.3, 6.1, 6.2, 7.2 and 9.1. Suppose that $d \geq 3$ and (L_1, L_2) is an orthogonal pair of lattices, so that each L_i is BW-type of rank 2^{d-1} .*

(i) $\mathfrak{X}$ is an orbit under the natural action of $F_1 \times F_2$, where $F_i := \text{Stab}_{\text{Aut}(L_i)}(L_i[1-r])$ (see 6.2; by induction, $F_i \cong G_{2^{d-1}}$). Define $Q_i := C_{F_i}(L_i/L_i[1])$.

The elements of $\mathfrak{X}$ are in correspondence with each of the following sets.

- (a) F_1/Q_1 ;*
- (b) F_2/Q_2 ;*
- (c) Pairs of involutions $\{s, -s\}$ in the orthogonal group on V which interchange L_1 and L_2 .*
- (d) Dihedral groups of order 8 which are generated by the SSD involutions associated to L_1, L_2 and involutions as in (c).*

(ii) (a) The subgroup G_L^0 of $F_1 \times F_2$ which stabilizes L has structure $Q_1 \times Q_2 \leq G_L^0$ and $G_L^0/(Q_1 \times Q_2)$ is the diagonal subgroup of $F_1/Q_1 \times F_2/Q_2$ with respect to the isomorphism induced by s , an involution as in (i.c).

(b) The subgroup G_L of $\text{Aut}(L_1 \perp L_2) \cong \text{Aut}(L_i) \wr 2$ which stabilizes L is $G_L^0 \langle s \rangle$. We have $G_L \cong [2_+^{1+2(d-1)} \times 2_+^{1+2(d-1)}].[\Omega^+(2(d-1), 2) \times 2]$.

(c) The subgroup of G_L which acts trivially on $L/L[1]$ is $R := \langle Q_{12}, s, t_i \rangle$, where t_i is the SSD involution associated to L_i and $Q_{12} := \{xx^s | x \in Q_1\}$. The quotient $G_L/R \cong 2^{2d-2}:\Omega^+(2d-2, 2)$ is a maximal parabolic subgroup of $\text{Out}^0(2_+^{1+2d}) \cong \Omega^+(2d, 2)$. (See Appendix A.0).

Remark 3.3. The extension in (c) is split, despite G_{2^e} being nonsplit over R_{2^e} for $e \geq 4$. See Appendix A2.

Proof. (i) We prove the classification by induction. For $d = 2$, $\text{Aut}(L_{D_4}) \cong 2_+^{1+4}[\text{Sym}_3 \wr 2]$ and for $d = 3$, $\text{Aut}(L_{E_8}) \cong W_{E_8}$. When $d = 4$, the main theorem follows from the arguments of [1].

For the rest of the proof, we assume that $d \geq 4$. By induction, a lattice satisfying the $X(2^{d-1})$ condition is uniquely determined up to isometry. This applies to the lattices L_1, L_2 .

Let $(L, L_1, L_2, t) \in \mathfrak{X}$. Then $\det(L)$ and $|L : L_1 \perp L_2|$ are determined. Define $G := \text{Aut}(L)$.

Let p_i be the orthogonal projection of L to $V_i := \mathbb{Q} \otimes L_i$, for $i = 1, 2$. Since L is integral, L^{p_i} , the projection of L to V_i is contained in L_i^* . When d is odd, L^{p_i} must be $L_i^* = L_i[-1]$, by determinant considerations.

Assume now that d is even. There is a subgroup H of $C_G(t)$, $H \cong \text{BRW}^0(2^{d-1}, +)$, so that H acts faithfully on both V_i and stabilizes L , L_1 and L_2 . By 7.14 and $X(2^d)(f)$, the projection is $L_i[-1]$, where the twist is with respect to a lower fourvolution in H . Since the groups Q_i act trivially on $L_i[-1]/L_i$, for $i = 1, 2$, the group $\langle Q_1, Q_2, t \rangle$ stabilizes L and in fact acts trivially on $L/L_1 \perp L_2$. We define a group $R := \langle Z(Q_1), Z(Q_2), Q_{12}, t \rangle \cong 2_+^{1+2d}$, where $Q_{12} := \{xx^t | x \in Q_1\}$.

Let D be the dihedral group which is generated by t and either t_i , the involution generating $Z(Q_i)$ (or what is the same, the RSSD involution associated to L_i). It follows that L is determined by L_1, L_2, D in the sense that L lies between $L_1 \perp L_2$ and $L_1[-1] \perp L_2[-1]$ and $L/[L_1 \perp L_2]$ is the fixed point submodule for the action of D (equivalently, of t) on $[L_1[-1] \perp L_2[-1]]/[L_1 \perp L_2]$. Recall from earlier in the proof that D does determine the $L_i[-1]$ by use of $X(f)$.

Now, to what extent do L and $L_1 \perp L_2$ determine D ? The answer is: up to conjugacy in $\text{Aut}(L_1 \perp L_2) \cong \text{Aut}(L_1) \wr 2$ (note that $d \geq 4$ here). Our group D is generated by the center of the natural index 2 subgroup of $\text{Aut}(L_1 \perp L_2)$ and a wreathing involution. In general, wreathing involutions in a wreath product of groups $K \wr 2$ form an orbit under the action of either direct factor isomorphic to K in the base group of the wreath product. This

proves correspondence of $\mathfrak{X}$ with (c) and (d). The stabilizer subgroup is diagonal in the base group $K \times K$, and either direct factor represents all cosets of the stabilizer (whence the equivalence of $\mathfrak{X}$ with (a) and (b))

It follows that, up to isometry preserving $L_1 \perp L_2$, D , hence L , is determined by the pair of indecomposable lattices L_1 and L_2 .

Proof of statement (ii) is easy. The statement about parabolic subgroups is proven with a standard result from the theory of Chevalley groups, e.g. [4]. Independently of that theory, the maximality could be proved directly by showing that there is no system of imprimitivity on the set of isotropic points. This is an exercise with Witt's theorem. $\square$

4 Other Revisions

In the Abstract, p.147, line 10, insert “which” after “ $(\log_2(\text{mass}(n)))$ ”.

End of first paragraph Theorem 2.7. Change “ $(\frac{1}{8} + o(1))d 2^d$.” to “ $(\frac{1}{8} + o(1))d 2^d$.”

In Appendix 2 of [2], the statement of Lemma 15.9 is incorrect (and the lemma is not used). A correct analysis of involutions in the BRW-group is in [3].

References

- [1] Robert L. Griess, Jr, Pieces of Eight, Advances in Mathematics, 148, 75-104 (1999).
- [2] Robert L. Griess, Jr., Pieces of 2^d : Existence and uniqueness for Barnes-Wall and Ypsilanti lattices, Advances in Mathematics 196 (2005) 147-192.
- [3] Robert L. Griess, Jr., Involutions on the the Barnes-Wall lattices and their fixed point sublattices, I; about 40 pages. Submitted 2005.
- [4] Roger Carter, Simple Groups of Lie Type, Wiley-Interscience, London (1972).